Subject: Chat with wilfredguerin@gmail.com
From: "wilfredguerin@gmail.com" <wilfredguerin@gmail.com>
To: barriticus@gmail.com

wilfredguerin: <insultan> k, so you at least saw some of the early tech, bbs, and related stuff
[17:30] <BarrettBrown> yep
[17:30] <insultan> ouch... coin opens saying "im stuck inside this tiny video game"
[17:31] <insultan> try something more potent and simple:
[17:31] <insultan> vulnerabilities and backdoors are designed exploits in systems such as m$ with the primary porpose to sponsor major organized crime and terrorism
[17:32] <insultan> remember, i was the primary factor for the mid 1990s proof that exploit systems and sponsorship of organized crime was an unneccessary burdon on common consumers
[17:32] <insultan> and that the institutions were invalid in their attempt to treat your video game console as a defense contractor mainframe
wilfredguerin: sorry for multiple boxes, webchat is being jammed
wilfredguerin: yes, the entire DESIGN of those systems is to provide exploitability
wilfredguerin: to make organized crime a SOFT TARGET
wilfredguerin: it makes law enforcement easier and more profitable with less risk
me: no prob, you're saying that there's intentionality in process by which early, for-fun-or-theory computers took on their crippled current state, relative to what they could have been?
wilfredguerin: so, as the example with howard a schmidt, who ran ms product security for over a decade
wilfredguerin: not really... the machine you are using is a fininte constrained system
wilfredguerin: do you have much EE/asm background?
wilfredguerin: all the computer can do is beep a certain set of ways
me: None at all
me: I was a writer
wilfredguerin: ok, easier to explain ;)
me: Got into this subject due to something that happened to me, couple of other people with HBGary thing
wilfredguerin: the fundamental concept is this:
wilfredguerin: a wire can only handle a certain range of power, a certain variability in scope, a profile
wilfredguerin: not enough power, the signal doesnt get through
wilfredguerin: too much power, the wire burns
wilfredguerin: right?
wilfredguerin: now the same range of validity exists for all systems
wilfredguerin: some are more constrained and finite than others... butterfly effect etc
wilfredguerin: in a computer, there is a range of options, all of the options for process operations are from a single finite set... add, increment, multiply, move data around

wilfredguerin: of these, only a small % of the permutations are valid
wilfredguerin: aka ... they do something
wilfredguerin: so in these finite constrained systems, like most modern computes
wilfredguerin: rs
wilfredguerin: there is only a very small set of options that work
wilfredguerin: it is fundamentally impossible to not know what works or doesnt, and it is impossible to not know that somethign doesnt work, mathematically
wilfredguerin: these CPU systems were designed in the 1960s based on mathematical models that indicated what fundamental operations were needed to do most everything
wilfredguerin: see RISC
wilfredguerin: so, of the options, the machine can only do certain specific things
me: and so it was intentional, is what you're confirming?
wilfredguerin: anything it does must be explicitly designed
wilfredguerin: its impossible not to be
wilfredguerin: this is why DMCA was designed
me: or am I misunderstanding?
wilfredguerin: because these finite constrained systems are so simple, they beep 12 ways, literally
wilfredguerin: any exploit, any transfer of your bank data to a terrorist
wilfredguerin: MUST be designed as such
wilfredguerin: and because the systems are finite and rigidly coded, these exploits or invalidities in software are very easy to track
wilfredguerin: --- here branches 30 topics, name one ;)
me: Fundamental leaps or variations on this principle in last ten years?
wilfredguerin: the entire purpose of the system, this "video game" known as computer devices and internet
wilfredguerin: over the last two decades
wilfredguerin: remember, in the 70s computers were still hobby
wilfredguerin: so some common use in the 80s, and in pops microsoft and the rest
wilfredguerin: ps2 was removed from market because it was not vulnerable enough
wilfredguerin: and the linux/nix systems are fundamentally flawed -- skip that
wilfredguerin: so the CPU, because its a physical chip, can only do a set of things
wilfredguerin: sneezing is not possible
wilfredguerin: simplifying this...
wilfredguerin: remmeber your mouse traip?
wilfredguerin: the dilusional claim that USDOC wants you to have "equal opportunity"?
wilfredguerin: its imposible.
wilfredguerin: there is only one set of correct ways to run a computer system
wilfredguerin: its designed that way
wilfredguerin: ...
wilfredguerin: so to keep the system open
wilfredguerin: they designed a mandatory openness

wilfredguerin: you can stick a floppy in any machine and not use m$
wilfredguerin: boot cd, etc
wilfredguerin: however M$, a commerce entity, must be internally exploitable SO THAT YOU HAVE OPPORTUNTIY
me: What level of overall influence on direction do you think In-Q-Tel has right now?
wilfredguerin: iqt appeared only last decade... its really not relevant
wilfredguerin: remember, google itself is run by US customs ... designed and built after the altavista issue
me: Palantir only appeared more recently than that, already somewhat crucial
wilfredguerin: the video game system itself is where the problem is... the ENTIRE system is designed for exploitability
me: being younger and having perceived only last two decades, I probably have different conception of how fast something can make an impact
me: right, I get that overall point
me: which is something I missed previously
wilfredguerin: remember, the telephone and telegraph systems took two centuararies to put in place...
me: is there a particular article, paper you'd recommend for me to look at specifics of this case?
me: of this dynamic, rather?
wilfredguerin: look into the DMCA fundamental... M SHAMOS and howard schmidt
wilfredguerin: this is really the root of it
wilfredguerin: dmca was designed to protect these exploits that the fedearl institution mandated
me: great, will do that first
wilfredguerin: it also makes it illegal for you to KNOW that MIM wire exploits are designed
me: then will probably have more questions for you on specifics
me: jesus
wilfredguerin: likely bunches ;)
me: okay
wilfredguerin: so, look ath the declaration of m shamos
me: thanks again, gotta tend to something but will get back to you soon, and I'm always available at this e-mail
wilfredguerin: "2600 shamos dmca"
me: m shamos, gotcha
wilfredguerin: this is usually on, msg whenever ;)
wilfredguerin: more important, concentrate on howard schmit
wilfredguerin: dt
wilfredguerin: he designed ALL of the exploits
wilfredguerin: even before internet was mainstreamed in 96
wilfredguerin: dmca 2600 shamos (eff) and howard A Schmidt
wilfredguerin: keep in mind... "internet" as a propaganda system is still expanding, its only

half way through the intended lifespan schedule ;)
wilfredguerin: link just dropped, hopefully you got all of that
wilfredguerin: barriticus: m shamos, gotcha
me: this is usually on, msg whenever ;)
more important, concentrate on howard schmit
dt
he designed ALL of the exploits
even before internet was mainstreamed in 96
dmca 2600 shamos (eff) and howard A Schmidt
keep in mind... "internet" as a propaganda system is still expanding, its only half way through the intended lifespan schedule ;)
link just dropped, hopefully you got all of that
me: all logged, will look up shamos tomorrow and go from there
wilfredguerin: http://www.2600.com/dvd/docs/2000/0630-shamos.html
me: thanks again, this is useful stuff and will def have questions
wilfredguerin: as mentioned in the obsama text pastebin
wilfredguerin: but once you understand shamos lied for diebold/dmca
wilfredguerin: you concentrate on SCHMIDT
wilfredguerin: but please just stay alive
wilfredguerin: http://pastebin.com/YPNKLzKG oBSama.com's old text... general timeline overview
wilfredguerin: i am NOT finding the more insider docs... remind me later
me: will do, really appreciate it
wilfredguerin: thats just an easy entry point ;) it gets complex from there
wilfredguerin: schmidt on its own, is a big enough explination to write 5 pages just to outline
wilfredguerin: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VpNEYW7JF7Q&feature=plcp
wilfredguerin: that was the wrong 2600 link... the testimony for diebold is a separate file
wilfredguerin: sorry
me: no problem
wilfredguerin: that video original full should be on wh.gov re schmidt cyber